THEOLOGY

VOL. LIX JANUARY, 1956 No. 427

Editorial

WHAT is called "the problem of communication" is a cluster of problems. How to communicate the meaning of the words with which the proclamation of the Gospel is inescapably identified is only one of them, but it is one about which every Christian can *do* something. First, by making sure that he himself has as clear and deep an understanding as possible of the meaning of the great Christian words; then, by equipping himself, whether as preacher or teacher or witness or for the opportunities that daily conversation affords, to bring these words to life for people to whom they are at present practically dead. Three books before us are calculated to provide help in these operations.

The most solid and valuable is Professor John Burnaby's *Christian Words and Christian Meanings* (Hodder and Stoughton, 9s. 6d.). It contains a course of public lectures in the University of Cambridge. The lectures were addressed "primarily to those for whom the Christian language is no foreign tongue, but who may sometimes find it difficult to give any clear and precise account of the meaning of words which they are accustomed to hear and use". Eight pairs of words are considered: Faith and Knowledge, Revelation and Dogma, Love and Incarnation, Sin and Judgment, Forgiveness and Atonement, Sacrifice and Communion, Grace and Freedom, Salvation and Hope. Stretches of the lectures may have been found hard-going by an undergraduate auditory, but preachers intending to deal with any of these themes will find here just the material they want to stimulate and clear the mind before setting about the actual preparation of their sermons. In fact, it is a book that will make good preparatory reading for Lenten preachers. Sometimes Professor Burnaby himself puts a whole sermon in a single sentence, for example: "The most terrible of all Christ's sayings is this: 'I came not to call the righteous'." The book is packed with pregnant comments on familiar texts; it ought to have been provided with an index of Scripture references.

A New Testament Wordbook by Mr William Barclay (S.C.M. Press, 7s. 6d.) might be described as an instalment of Kittel's *Wörterbuch* for the layman. It contains articles, previously published in *The British Weekly*, on thirty-seven words from the New Testament. Mr Barclay has a remarkable gift for presenting the linguistic background and associations of Greek words to readers who have little or no Greek themselves. Preachers too, when expounding texts in which any of these words occur, will find that some very useful work

.59
956

has here been done for them. We shall be surprised if the author is not called upon to produce another volume of the same kind.

The third book takes into account the fact that, despite all the modern versions of the Bible now available, many Christians continue to use the Authorized Version, principally if not exclusively. *A Bible Word-Book* (Mowbray, 3s. 6d.) is described by its compiler, Mr Richard Tatlock, as "a dictionary, with examples, of obsolete, unusual and ambiguous words commonly used in the Authorized Version". It should prove a handy and enlightening aid to the ordinary Bible reader, for whom the English of King James I is no longer "the vulgar tongue". But it is also a book—like Fowler's *Modern English Usage*, though on a much more modest scale—into which anyone may dip with both pleasure and profit.

* * * * *

The late Bishop of Oxford, Dr Kenneth Kirk, had one of the most powerful minds that has been seen at work on the episcopal bench for some time. It was also one of the most interesting minds. You could never be quite sure at what conclusion it would arrive, still less by what processes of reasoning it would get there. His thinking as a bishop found its chief expression in the articles he contributed to the Oxford Diocesan Magazine. Some of these were substantial essays which appeared in two or more successive issues of the magazine. In a volume entitled *Beauty and Bands and other papers* (Hodder and Stoughton, 12s. 6d.) Canon E. W. Kemp (who is preparing a biography of the Bishop) has published a number of these articles together with some of Dr Kirk's sermons. The volume takes its title from a splendid sermon preached at the consecration of the Bishop of Swansea and Brecon in January, 1954. The magazine articles were occasioned by current events or controversies, but they always aimed at getting down to theological roots. In this way what was originally topical can remain permanently instructive. For example, what the Bishop wrote in 1940 about "Prayer in War-time" (an article that extended over six issues of the magazine) is so thorough an examination of the theology of intercessory prayer that it would not be out of place in a text-book on the subject. Dr Kirk was ever resourceful in argument, but he appears to have been much more a master of moral and ascetic theology than of dogmatic theology or ecclesiology. In particular, two sermons on the place of reward in the teaching of our Lord, and on the need for a new Christian casuistry which would be the work of laymen, show how much he could have done for us all if he had been free to continue to work in the field that he had made peculiarly his own before he was raised to the episcopate.

A Roman Catholic View of the Church of South India[1]

To follow the story of the union of the Churches in South India is to be struck by the way the traditionalist Anglicans kept on losing ground all along the line; nevertheless, when the results are considered in black and white, anyone who knows the Protestant Churches, especially the Presbyterians or the Congregationalists, will be amazed that their representatives were able in the end to accept so strong an infusion of more or less Catholic elements.

In particular, a comparison of the formularies of the Church of South India with those of the most conservative of the Reformed Churches gives one the impression that the former are nearer to the Catholic tradition than any of the latter, including the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England. The "priesthood of believers" and its relation to the ministerial priesthood are stated in terms which Catholic theologians would have no need to revise. The confession of faith, from the Catholic point of view, sins no doubt by omission, but there appears to be nothing lacking in its proclamation of the fundamental dogmas of the Trinity, the Incarnation and the Atonement. Even the way in which the "sovereignty of the Scriptures" is explained seems to be susceptible of an orthodox sense.

The candid lack of precision about the exact nature of episcopacy, if the basic requirements attaching to it are taken into account, seems, all things considered, more satisfactory than the altogether ambiguous formulas of the Anglican 16th-century documents.

Moreover, what is striking about the whole of this document (i.e. the Constitution) is its firm intention to construct. In this connexion its lack of precision and its deficiencies stand out less than those of the formularies of the Reformation period, in which the intention to reject and to limit seemed primary.

However, the living meaning of such a document is revealed only in practice. In particular, only so will the participation of laymen and presbyters in the exercise of even episcopal responsibilities be put to the test. Will bishops be prisoners of their synods and councils or will they be enabled to fulfil their office in conditions that are most favourable to well-informed co-operation? In other words, will their teaching and general pastoral responsibility be enhanced or handicapped? The future alone will show.

But we already have some interesting evidence about how the C.S.I. is going in practice to interpret its standards. There are two pieces of evidence which we propose to take into account here: (A) The Eucharistic Liturgy that the Church has produced; and

[1] This is the final section of a long article on "L'Union des Eglises du Sud de l'Inde" by R. P. Louis Bouyer which appeared in *Istina* (April-June 1955). We are grateful both to him and to the editor, R. P. C.-J. Dumont, O.P., for permission to publish this translation. The earlier sections of the article dealt with the history that led up to the union and with the "Basis of Union" and the "Constitution".

336365

(B) some lectures on the nature of the Church, which one of its new bishops, whose antecedents are not Anglican but Presbyterian, delivered.

(A) *An Order for the Lord's Supper*, which was published in 1954 (Oxford University Press, 1s. 3d.), considerably strengthens the impression made by the Basis of Union and the Constitution. This service was first used by the Synod at its second meeting at Madras in 1950. The Synod then authorized it for optional use in special circumstances instead of the liturgies that were in use prior to the Union. After being a little revised, it was formally approved by the Synod in January 1954 for general use. Indeed, we understand that it has nearly everywhere been keenly welcomed and that it is becoming the regular form of eucharistic service.

Now there is no doubt whatever that, while it skilfully incorporates quite unexceptionable Protestant customs, still, from the point of view of even a conservative Catholic (or Orthodox) liturgist, this eucharistic liturgy seems much more satisfactory than any liturgy that emanated from the Reformation. Unquestionably, it is much superior to the Prayer Book of the Church of England both on account of its traditional character and its theological soundness. Since this liturgy is designed for Christians of the Far East, extensive use has been made of the traditional Eastern liturgies. They are certainly much better suited than our austere Latin rites to oriental peoples such as those of India. That austerity was reproduced and indeed made more severe in what the Anglican liturgy retained of the Roman rite.

The liturgy begins with an equivalent of the little entrance in byzantine rites: the "presbyter" solemnly brings in the Bible from which the lessons are to be read. After the collect for purity, there is sung either the *Gloria in excelsis* or the *Trisagion* or a Litany (in which the deacon leads the responses) taken directly from the hymn to the Lamb in the Apocalypse. Then, if there has been no service of preparation beforehand, there is a short penitential section, analogous to the prayers which we say at the foot of the altar (the Protestant liturgists of the 16th century expanded these prayers to an intolerable extent: but that is not at all the case here). Next come the collect for the day and three lections from the Bible (Old Testament, Epistle, Gospel). A psalm or hymn may be sung between the O.T. lesson and the Epistle. After the sermon and the Nicene Creed, which is to be said or sung by all, the deacon leads the faithful in a litany of intercession (based on the Anglican Prayer for the Church, which in turn is derived from the oldest part of the early Roman litanies) or alternatively in the litany from the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom. "Or the presbyter may offer intercession in his own words for the Church and the world." The presbyter ends the diaconal litany with a collect: a choice is provided from traditional sources. Then he gives a blessing to those who are not communicating (as, in the byzantine liturgy, at any rate in Russia, the catechumens are still dismissed at this point).

All who remain stand, the presbyter says:

Behold, how good and joyful a thing it is, brethren, to dwell together in unity.

We who are many are one bread, one body, for we all partake of the one bread.

Then all say together:

I will offer in his dwelling an oblation with great gladness, I will sing and speak praises unto the Lord.

The *kiss of peace* may be given here.

The bread and wine and the alms of the people are now brought in procession and placed on the holy table, and the presbyter says:

Holy Father, who through the blood of thy dear Son hast consecrated for us a new and living way to thy throne of grace, we come to thee through him, unworthy as we are, and we humby beseech thee to accept and use us and these our gifts for thy glory. All that is in heaven and earth is thine, and of thine own do we give to thee. *Amen.*

Then all kneel and say together:

Be present, be present, O Jesus, thou good High Priest, as thou wast in the midst of thy disciples, and make thyself known to us in the breaking of the bread, who livest and reignest with the Father and the Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. Amen.

The presbyter stands and sings the *Preface*: versicles, responses and a proper preface or this clause suggested by the liturgy of St Basil:

Through Jesus Christ thy Son our Lord, through whom thou didst create the heavens and the earth and all that in them is, and didst make man in thine own image, and when he had fallen into sin didst redeem him to be the first fruits of a new creation. Therefore, etc.

After the Sanctus there follows this *Anaphora* (liturgists will be interested in tracing its different sources; they have been welded together in a masterly manner):

Truly holy, truly blessed art thou, O heavenly Father, who of thy tender love towards mankind didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there, by his one oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again: Who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you: do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper he took the cup, and, when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

Here the people answer:

Amen. Thy death, O Lord, we commemorate, thy resurrection we confess, and thy second coming we await. Glory be to thee, O Christ.

The presbyter continues:

Wherefore, O Father, having in remembrance the precious death and passion, and glorious resurrection and ascension, of thy Son our Lord, we thy servants do this in remembrance of him, as he hath commanded, until his coming again, giving thanks to thee for the perfect redemption which thou hast wrought for us in him.

The people answer:

> We give thanks to thee, we praise thee, we glorify thee, O Lord our God.

The presbyter concludes with this epiclesis, which leads up to the doxology:

> And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to sanctify with thy Holy Spirit, us and these thine own gifts of bread and wine, that the bread which we break may be the communion of the body of Christ, and the cup which we bless the communion of the blood of Christ. Grant that being joined together in him, we may all attain to the unity of the faith, and may grow up in all things unto him who is the Head, even Christ, our Lord, by whom and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. *Amen.*

After the final "Amen" the presbyter introduces the *Our Father,* which all say with him.

Then all say together the Prayer of Humble Access, as in the Anglican Prayer Book, except that it ends thus: "that our sinful bodies and souls may be made clean by his most precious Body and Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us. Amen."

The presbyter proceeds to break the bread, either in silence or saying "The Bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" or "The things of God for the people of God". In giving communion he may use whatever words the worshippers have been accustomed to before the union, but it is recommended that he shall say:

> The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, the bread of life.
> The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, the true vine.

The *Agnus Dei* is sung during the communion. There is a post-communion prayer to which the people answer:

> Amen. Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honour and power, and might, be unto our God for ever and ever. Amen.

The presbyter then gives the final benediction.

There is little that we wish to add by way of commentary. Obviously care has been taken to meet the anxiety of Protestants about any idea of a eucharistic sacrifice that adds something to the Cross, as though there could be a second crucifixion distinct from the first. But it should also be observed that the formulas by which the uniquity (*unicité*) of the Cross and the Christian sacrifice is affirmed do not necessarily imply any error from the Catholic point of view. From this point of view it is the more regrettable that no mention is made of the faithful departed except in the diaconal litanies, and that there is no explicit provision for a commemoration of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints. On the other hand, there can be nothing but praise for the way the Protesant desire for penitential prayers has been met, and for the possibility of free prayer by the minister without at all disturbing the traditional equilibrium of this liturgy.

Supposing that validly ordained ministers used it, it seems difficult to deny that they would validly consecrate the eucharist. In any case, the Catholic Church would certainly have much less difficulty in letting these Indian Christians continue to use such a liturgy, if ever

they came to her, than she would, under the same conditions, in letting any Protestant or Anglican community continue to use the rites and formularies to which they are accustomed.

(B) No less interesting is the evidence afforded by the book by Lesslie Newbigin, Bishop of Madura in the new Church, *The Household of God* (S.C.M. Press, 12s. 6d.). It will be remembered that at the time of the union in 1947 it was decided that the united Church should have fifteen bishops, of whom five came from Anglicanism; the other eight were consecrated in the form provided by the Constitution, three being ex-Congregationalists, three ex-Methodists, and one ex-Presbyterian. This last was Bishop Lesslie Newbigin, who has since played a leading part in the great ecumenical conferences. Any Catholic theologian who reads his book will find himself more than once rubbing his eyes to make sure that it is really a former Protestant who is speaking, and who is now "bishop" in a "Church" which is at first sight more "babelish" than "biblical", as Harnack would have said.

Not only does he now fully accept the "historic episcopate", which was the most that excellent Anglicans like Bishop Palmer hoped they might just succeed in getting accepted, but he has absorbed into the bargain practically the whole idea of "apostolic succession" which they themselves hardly believed altogether. It is true that he holds on the other hand that the true Church, together with this element of sacramental continuity with the apostolate, requires as equally necessary the union of all in that true faith which was proclaimed by the apostles, and the living reality of the Spirit as both source and object of the collective religious experience. But does he realize that in this way, while safeguarding what is positive *both* in "biblical" Protestantism *and* in "revivalist" Protestantism, he comes much nearer to the genuine Catholic and Roman conception of the "apostolic succession" than the High Anglicans do when they separate or seem to separate it from vital orthodoxy and manifest holiness?

We should naturally be less in agreement when Bishop Newbigin seeks to lay it down that, in order to find again this Church that is one with the fulness willed by God, it is necessary first to recognize that the Church is already there in all the Christian bodies where the Spirit is at work, and also that it is the Church herself who has sinned and goes on sinning in their divisions and what causes them. It seems to us that he here puts his finger on what is still the basic difference between the best Protestant ecumenism and the essential principle of all Catholic ecumenism. We all agree about the necessity of recognizing that the sins of us all provoked and continue to maintain schism and heresy. But the Catholic ecumenists believe that the Church, since she is the work and instrument of Christ who transcends those who constitute her and even those who govern her, cannot sin; though at the same time we are sure that the members of the Church, from the pope himself down to the least of the faithful, remain sinners, and as a matter of historical fact did sin in numberless situations and so fatally contributed to the disunity of Christians. Our Protestant friends, on the other hand, seem to us too readily to

take the side of a Church which is sinful through and through; at the same time we are struck by the fact that they will not acknowledge that the *churchmen* who caused the schism or heresy did actually sin, nor that they made any mistake, were it in good faith, *in whatever they did to ensure the future of their Christian communities.*

How else can one explain their persistence in maintaining, for example, that the ministry and sacraments of the separated "Churches" are just as valid as those of the traditional Church, even when they are seeking to recover a more traditional structure—even when, I would say, they are rediscovering its meaning and importance? We certainly quite understand that behind this paradoxical attitude they are concerned to maintain the authenticity of the gifts of God which they received, before they rediscovered the structure which now they tend to acknowledge God willed for his Church. But it seems to us that two things are here confused, and it is a confusion that was evident throughout the South India negotiations: viz. the objective means of grace given by God and the subjective experience of grace.

Again, Bishop Newbigin seems to us fully justified in vigorously opposing certain Anglican theologians who are inclined to make an absolute separation between these two things, as if there could be an experience of grace which was not also an experience of belonging to the body of Christ. Indeed, we would go so far as to say that his objections seem to us to apply not only to the Anglicans whom he has in view but also to many Catholic theologians who are rather too eager to solve by purely verbal solutions the problem of what they call "the salvation of unbelievers".

But he forgets that the Catholic Church herself by no means has an all or nothing theology of membership in her own body. All the baptized, all who have received the Gospel with faith, even if they do not live in her bosom, provided that their absence is not their personal fault, belong to her. But it is quite another question whether the rites they celebrate, doubtless in entire good faith, are the acts of Christ done in his name by those whom he sent for the purpose, or whether they are only a sketch (*esquisse*) of those acts, done by excellent Christians who in point of fact have not been sent and who therefore have not his authority to do what they do in his Name; there is an unbridgeable distinction between these two things. The "experience" of the Spirit, however genuine it may be, does not enter into the question. We ourselves believe that the faithful Catholic to whom the whole living organism of the true Church is available, when he cannot communicate sacramentally, can do so purely "spiritually", perhaps with as much grace as he would receive by a sacramental communion and even more. Still more do we believe that those who seek Christ without being in the Church, and not being outside by their fault, find grace when they seek to do what he has ordained. But all this in no way alters the fact that he sent his apostles, that his apostles sent others, and that those who rejected these others did something which cannot be undone by their de-

scendants except by returning to Christ's authentic representatives, and by acknowledging the error of departing from them.

We shall never come to the essential point until we come to that. If the Church is the work of God and not of men, it is not good will nor good faith nor even personal sanctity that can recreate her. She must be sought where God has placed her; it is an illusion to suppose that she will ever be rediscovered where she is not and never has been. No doubt the first need is to rediscover the right idea of the Church. We cannot help admiring the sure instinct which leads Bishop Newbigin in that direction; he has got much further than the most traditionalist of those who brought into existence the new Church which he represents. But it is still the case that the idea of the true Church is one thing and the reality another. Reality will never be regained from the idea alone, for the idea itself has simply been disengaged by men from the reality given by God.

To be sure, those who have the extraordinary grace of living already in this reality have nothing to boast about, but they ought rather to be humiliated by the little fruit they produce while those who are still without often manifest such a wonderful faithfulness to the little that they have. But for the sons who have stayed in the Father's house true charity does not consist in letting the prodigal children suppose that their provisional shelters are already the Father's house: quite the contrary.

On the other hand, we shall find it much easier to accept Bishop Newbigin's eloquent appeal not to separate the missionary obligation from the obligation to unity: Christendom ought to be one in its evangelical life in order to carry the Gospel to the world. This is not to say that the obligation to reunion rests merely on pragmatic grounds, but much rather that one cannot preach what one is not beginning to practise.

In conclusion, here are some subjects for reflection which this study seems to us to pose to the Catholic theologian.

The extent to which, during the past century, the Christians who separated from the Church in the 16th century have already come to realize the meaning and the need of this Church is very remarkable. But it cannot be denied that, in this phase which we believe to be only preparatory to the true reunion, there is a danger that they may get bogged down in what they have already recovered. This danger is evident in the history of the C.S.I. both for the Protestants and for the Anglicans.

The older school of Protestants believed that the true Church is invisible. The very idea of an objective "validity" of the ministry or sacraments seemed to them a typically Catholic idea that was inseparable from the Catholic Church which they rejected precisely on that ground. Consequently it would never have entered their heads to claim it for themselves. To-day, on the contrary, many Protestants are rediscovering the authentically evangelical value of the Church as a visible institution. But their temptation then is to claim for their own institutions the spiritual reality of the visible Church

which is properly Catholic. In doing so, they forget that their institutions were set up and for long maintained against the Catholic Church. In other words, when the truth of what the Catholic Church affirms about itself is rediscovered, what prevents a return to her is often the temptation to make, out of what was originally set up in opposition to it, an ersatz Catholic Church.

As for the Anglicans, it cannot be denied that, especially since the Oxford movement and throughout the ecumenical movement, they have powerfully helped Protestants in general to rediscover many of the lineaments of the tradition they had lost. But it is also to be noted that the Anglicans borrowed from the Catholic Church itself many notions, such as that of "apostolic succession", in a period when our theological tradition was not always shining very brightly. So it is not altogether surprising to see Protestants, through an independent study of the New Testament and of the primitive Church presented in the light of that return to sources which is characteristic of Christianity to-day, returning in fact (even if unconsciously) much nearer to the true Catholic idea. This is certainly the case with Bishop Newbigin, and the eucharistic liturgy of his Church shows that in this he is representative of a whole spiritual and intellectual movement.

And this brings us to a point of capital importance: do Catholic theologians, indeed do the ecclesiastical authorities themselves, appreciate the extent to which the present development of all that is best in Protestantism tends to be a search for, and a rediscovery of, the true tradition? Is there not significance in the example of this Church of South India, despite the fact that it came into existence in conditions in which some of the most traditional elements were treated very lightly? One would expect it to represent a final victory of dogmatic imprecision and that it would admit Catholic forms only after they had been altogether "protestantized". And yet we see now that it appears to be more dogmatic, more sacramental, more open to ideas and realities that are authentically Catholic than any of the "Churches" out of which it was formed. Does not this mean that Catholics ought to be much bolder in trying to bear intelligible testimony, before divided Christendom, to the Catholic realities and ideas for which they are responsible before the world?

In particular, we should observe how we need ourselves some deeper work on the theology of episcopacy. It is curious to see how the Anglicans, throughout this history, have remained prisoners (1) of an idea of the bishop in which it was the more or less autocratic ecclesiastical administrator who is to the fore—and in which the trustee of the apostolic mission, "the ambassador of Christ", sent by him as he was sent by the Father, and in consequence the pastor, the teacher of truth, the president of the eucharistic banquet, were almost left out of sight; and (2) of an idea of the ministry in general in which more was made of the distinction between "episcopate" and "presbyterate" than of the unity between them, neither being satisfactorily elucidated.

The true Catholic tradition about this, if it were properly brought

out, would perhaps have enabled the Anglicans more effectively to save what they regarded as essential, while at the same time making it much more acceptable to the most considering of the Protestants. But who of us is in a position to reproach the Palmers, the Whiteheads, and the Azariahs, when we recall that their theology on these points depended on ideas borrowed from our manuals at a period when they assuredly did not do justice to all that the Catholic tradition, in its fulness and completeness, contains of complementary and reconciling treasures?

Louis Bouyer.

The Inspiration of the Bible[1]

2 Cor. 4. 7: But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the exceeding greatness of the power may be of God, and not from ourselves.

The position of a Faculty of Theology in a university is not without ambiguity. On the one hand, it stands alongside the other Faculties, pursuing the argument where it goes, by the application of those methods which are proper to its subject. If it remains true to the best traditions of its past, it need not fear the accusation of unprofessional conduct. For it was the theologians who did more than any to bring into being those methods of literary and historical analysis which now govern, not only their own studies, but the studies of others also. So far from its being the case, as is commonly supposed, that the modern methods of historical investigation were first perfected outside the field of theological studies, and were then applied, perhaps somewhat reluctantly, to the study of the Bible and Christian history, the opposite is nearer the truth. The pioneers in the field of textual criticism, Richard Bentley and Carl Lachmann, graduated in their science not upon classical texts but upon the text of the New Testament, and, perhaps significantly, Bentley never produced his text because he found the conditions so much more complex in the study of the New Testament than in the study of classical texts. When Wilamowitz dedicated his Homeric Studies to the Old Testament scholar Julius Wellhausen he greeted him as the pioneer of that method of rolling back the history of the transmission of the text which he himself was now using. Methods evolved within the heart of Christian studies, in order to enable theologians to handle the problems presented by their own subject matter, have contributed greatly to the specifically modern study of history in general. The theologian wishes therefore to stand as a scholar alongside other scholars.

On the other hand, he cannot remain unaware of the implications which his studies have for others. This is the case with other scholars also, including, of late, the scientists, but with the biblical scholar it is especially so. He cannot forget that the subject matter of his study is that through which, to many thousands in actuality, and to all men

[1] A sermon preached before the University of Oxford on Sunday, 9 October 1955.

potentially, the living God speaks his living word; or that his subject hardly has a right to exist, and certainly would not exist, except as the handmaid of the Church. He reminds himself that the Lord did not walk and talk in Galilee in order that learned journals might be published. He cannot remain unmoved by the feeling expressed by P. T. Forsyth when he wrote: "I do not believe in verbal inspiration. I am with the critics in principle. But the true minister ought to find the words and phrases of the Bible so full of spiritual food and felicity that he has some difficulty in not believing in verbal inspiration." There is a tension between his critical method and his subject matter, when that subject matter is placed in its fullest context, between the analytic and often negative approach of the one, and the unitive, affirmative nature of the other. How acute this tension can become appears from the recent controversial letters in *The Times* newspaper, since published as a pamphlet, on Fundamentalism, and although the controversy arose over events that were to take place in Cambridge, the problem is very much with us here too in Oxford, and is not unconnected with claims to a widespread religious revival. No doubt fundamentalism has its sociological and psychological aspects, according to which it is part of a search for security in a world terrifyingly insecure. Those also who know the human heart will not deny that criticism at times has been made a smoke screen for much wilful rebellion and culpable unbelief. But the problem goes much deeper than that, and anyone concerned with Christian truth is in some measure involved in it. From time to time the biblical scholar, however humble his place, must take his eyes off his immediate work and look at the larger scene.

The inspiration of the Scriptures is not a dogma. At least the Church as a whole has never ventured a dogmatic definition of it. The experience of the Church in those periods when one single view has predominated—allegorism in the 4th century or biblicism in the 19th—is not such as to encourage us to look for such a definition. When the Church has been most vigorous she has assumed the Bible to be inspired, and has got on with the business of interpreting it. Inspiration is a mystery; like all divine mysteries it is hidden from our sight. But the results and impress of inspiration are matters subject to our observation, and we have the right to expect that, by observing them carefully, we may catch some glimpse of how the divine spirit operates, and intends to operate, towards and in our human nature, as Moses was permitted to catch some glimpse of God's hinder parts as he passed by. Indeed, must we not go further or perish? Must we not claim that the same Holy Spirit, who spake by the prophets, and who inspired the Scriptures, does, in another and lesser mode of his operation, lead men to a right critical exercise of the natural reason upon the same Scriptures? It was the absence of any such suggestion in the letters to *The Times*, with one exception, that was perhaps the most disturbing feature about them. When Charles Gore wrote his essay on "The Holy Spirit and Inspiration" in *Lux Mundi* he delivered many in one section of the Church of England, and possibly others also, from the alternatives of obscur-

antism or unbelief; and it was part of the strength of that essay that he refused to treat the question of inspiration until he had first written at length about the Holy Spirit. He noted as the marks of his working that it was gradual, having as its object the consecration of the whole of nature, that it was varied, employing manifold expressions of the natural genius, and that it was social, bringing men to the height of their individuality within a holy community. Sixty-five years have passed since he wrote, but if much has happened in biblical studies the issues remain much the same. The objections now are not markedly different from those of Liddon when he complained of Gore's restrictions upon the predictive power of prophecy, his alliance with rationalistic theories of composition, his extension of the dramatic hypothesis to writings which seemed to claim an historical character, and the admission of myth as a constituent element in the Old Testament. And if there is much now of which Gore would have disapproved, it would not be difficult to show that it is in line with principles which he himself laid down as to the substance, the instruments and the locus of divine revelation.

First, as to its substance. Out of what does God make his revelation to us? The more thoroughly historical investigation is applied the more it removes old landmarks and brings to light the intimate connexion between the Scriptures on the one hand, and the concepts and practices, the myth and ritual, of the total environment in which Israel and the Christian Church at any time lived on the other. One by one characteristics which had been thought to be peculiar to the religion of the Bible are paralleled, and are no longer differentia of that religion from the general run of semitic belief or hellenistic mysticism. Nor can these similarities be limited to certain periods labelled primitive, and therefore easily detached and left on one side; they pervade throughout, as each new stage in the development takes something from the old. There is no naked biblical religion, but only that which comes to us clothed in the thoughts forms and culture of its age. Even if we say, as we must, that the Scriptures lie under the impress of the prophets, and that the Spirits spake by the prophets, this does not mean that the prophets were altogether peculiar. Rather does it seem to mean that through the prophets history is distinguished from nature as the principal medium of God's revelation, is made pre-eminent over it and interpretative of it. The identification of nature with deity is broken. Its processes of sowing and harvest, begetting and fatherhood, are set free from the cycle of nature so that they can be made to point to a creative work of God, a kingly rule and judgment of God, who makes himself known in his particular acts, and as he encounters men in their history. In doing so the prophets initiated a faith that was progressive. They opened the way to a real future, and made of religion something which looked forward and pressed onwards to further embodiment and incarnation. This embodiment is found only partly in the Judaism to which their prophecy gave rise; it is found fully in Christ. But Christ himself is so completely clothed with our natural life, and is so closely united with that Jewish form of it which prophets and rabbis

had created out of it, that for that very reason he can become a scandal when finality is claimed for him. Though he be God's final revelation to us, yet his identification with us is such that he does not bring things to a stop; rather he opens up an even wider future for the world, which is now a future in Christ, and its goal the summing up of all things in him.

It would seem, therefore, that the mode of God's revelation which the Scriptures themselves suggest, the more stringently they are examined, is represented neither by a doctrine of immanence, in which nature is left where it was, identified with deity, nor by a doctrine of transcendence in which nature is left on one side, and God brings something new and strange down on our heads like a ton of bricks, but rather by what St John Chrysostom called the *sunkatabasis* of God, the condescension of God to the measure of his creation, by which he moulds it from within to be an expression of his will. The great texts of St John and St Paul, "The Word became flesh" and "Christ took upon himself the form of a servant" speak to us not only of the Incarnation itself, but of the way God at all times has been dealing with men. If this then is the way that God reveals himself, this is the way in which we must receive his revelation, with due respect for the means through which it is made. It thus becomes less possible for us than for our predecessors to cut the Scriptures up into that which is credible to a 20th-century man and that which can be left behind as old clothes. A deeper analysis gives them back to us more as an organic whole; but, once the facts are scientifically known, this can be on one condition only, namely, that we admit those things which Liddon denied, and admit them to a far greater extent than Gore dreamt of asking, viz. rationalistic theories of composition, the extension of the dramatic hypothesis to writings which claim a historical character, and the presence of myth as a constituent element in the Scriptures.

Secondly, as to the instruments. It is common at the present time to stress that the Christian revelation is a revelation through history. This is entirely proper, and as a corrective to a scholasticism, Catholic or Protestant, which supposes the Bible to be a repository of divine propositions, very salutary. But of itself it is not sufficient. The best history in the Bible, as we understand history, is to be found in the first book of Maccabees, but it would be a hardy theologian who would contend that the core of the revelation was to be found in that book. If we were looking for it during this period we would be more likely to find it in the contemporary book of Daniel, not by reason of the history contained in that book, which is dubious indeed, but by reason of certain great conceptions and images, the eternal kingdom of God, the saints of the most high, the Son of Man upon the clouds, by means of which the history is interpreted. Event and language belong together in the Scriptures as a matter and form in the sacrament, the latter giving life to the former. But of what kind is this language? Older writers used to speak of the Scriptures as the language of the Holy Ghost, and old-fashioned lexicons were in the habit of listing the words peculiar

to the Bible under the heading of "biblical Greek". But, lecturing in 1863, J. B. Lightfoot let drop the remark that if we could only recover the letters which ordinary people wrote without any thought of being literary we should have the greatest possible help in understanding the language of the New Testament. What Lightfoot desiderated has come to pass. Egyptian waste-paper baskets have yielded up sufficient of their contents to show that the language of the Scriptures is none other than the vernacular tongue. One by one instances of biblical Greek are struck off the list. There is, in this sense, no language specially minted for the conveyance of divine truth. But further knowledge of the facts does not destroy what Schleiermacher called "the capacity of Christianity to mould language"; it only locates it elsewhere. For the more closely the language of the Scriptures is scrutinized the more it appears that the language understanded of the people undergoes in the Scriptures a subtle deflection from its ordinary meaning, sometimes even as far as the opposite of its ordinary meaning, and it is difficult to resist the conclusion that this is the result of the pressure upon men's minds and hearts of their relation to God, and of his revelation of himself to them. Covenant, kingship, war and peace, salvation and judgment, shepherd and sheep, marriage and adultery, these words, which govern men's thoughts and desires, are taken out of the sphere of their natural and worldly occupations, are redirected in such a way that they can no longer be exhausted by a purely natural content, and become symbols of that supernatural life which God desires to give to men in communion with himself. With these images Christ, whose life and work falls so completely within the natural, clothes himself, uniting them and refashioning them so that they are no longer disparate or contradictory. In their fullest supernatural meaning they fit him alone. But if through the Spirit's work this language is no longer the language of primitive natural science which it once was, neither has it become the language of discursive reasoning fitted to philosophy and systematic theology. It is rather the language of poetry, and none the less poetry because its craftsmanship is largely unconscious and its object not the poet's wonder and delight in the creature, but the praise of, and obedience to, the Creator. Perhaps the theologian has been too easily scared away from the poet, whom Coventry Patmore once described as "holding a strange position in the hierarchy of things halfway between the saint and Balaam's ass". It will not do, therefore, simply to reiterate "the Bible says". We are concerned with what God is saying, and with the way in which he says it. Fundamentalism ignores this, and brings to the interpretation of the language of the Bible a literalness and hardness which, it must be noted, is of very recent origin, because it is the product of an age that has come to assume that there is only one kind of truth and only one kind of vehicle of truth. "Fundamentalism," wrote Michael Roberts, "may have the Bible for its mother, but it has for its father Thomas Hobbes . . . who regarded poetry as trivial, and who denied that there were any things which needed to be said which could only be said through the poetic use of lan-

guage." Hence, he continued, "when the modern atheist denies that he has a Father in heaven he is denying something which his ancestors never asserted, for he is interpreting in the strictest terms of physical time and space and matter words which were first used with no thought of such interpretation".

Thirdly, as to the locus of revelation. The critical analysis of the Scriptures, as it is pressed further and deeper, leads at every point—and this is a truth still unwelcome to some—to the Church, to the people of God, as the sphere within which the language of revelation has worked, and continues to work, with power for the drawing of the natural life of men into a living touch with the supernatural life of God. The Gospels, it is now seen, are not biographies, but compositions, more poetically subtle than was imagined, out of stories and traditions which already had a history behind them in the faith and worship of the Church, out of which they came, and which they existed to serve. And, as the Fourth Gospel reminds us, the events, and the faith and life to which the events gave rise, are so smelted that the one cannot be had without the other. In epistles, in which apostolic men address the Church, we stumble at any moment upon fragments of creed, catechism or liturgy, and there are few passages which can be fully understood except within the Church's life. It would seem to be part of the mystery of inspiration that so much of what has become for us Holy Scripture was domestic to the Church, and almost occasional in its origin. God's way of admitting us into his revelation, it would appear, is to allow us to overhear snatches of his conversation with the Church, and so to draw us into its tradition and life. It is not enough for Bible societies to publish the figures of Bibles distributed throughout the world as though in themselves they were a matter for simple congratulation. The Scriptures are not alive except within the society which they were intended to create and recreate. It is not the public but the private use of them which stands in need of justification.

As Christians we ought to desire to live under the authority of God, and under the authority of persons or things only as they minister to us the authority of God. It is possible so to glorify God's instruments as to detract from the supremacy of the God whose instruments they are. The desire for an infallibility short of the infallibility of God, be it of Church or Bible, is an idolatrous lust. And we must beware even of how we think of the infallibility of God himself. For all arguments for infallibility are *a priori*, and divine infallibility is generally held to be a plain inference from God's nature. "If God is God then surely he does this"; "if God is God then it follows that he will have done that". That is how the argument runs. And the questions that the critic is bound to ask are: "does he?" and "has he?", and asking them he appeals to the evidence. The critic has no right to dictate to men what they shall believe; his task is much humbler than that. He is a mere hewer of wood and drawer of water. But he has the right to ask that men take his work into account, if it is truly done, in making up their minds what to believe. And if his work is chiefly a preoccupation with the earthenness of

those vessels which it has pleased God to use, it need not for that reason be only a negative or destructive work, for it can prepare the way at any moment for the acknowledgment that the exceeding greatness of the power is of God and not from ourselves.

C. F. Evans.

The Annulment of Marriage

In 1949, at the request of the Convocations, the Archbishops appointed a Commission "to examine the laws of Nullity, ecclesiastical and civil, and questions relating thereto, in their general and practical bearings", and its Report has recently been published.[1] It is a lucid, concise, and scholarly document which sets forth the theory, history, and practice of nullity, both civil and ecclesiastical, and its clear treatment of this complex subject should prove of great value to those who wish to trace the evolution and inter-relation of canon and secular law in this connexion. There is also some useful material in the Appendices—especially those by Dr G. D. Kilpatrick on the New Testament teaching concerning marriage and divorce, and by Dr E. O. James on the anthropological aspects of monogamy.

From its terms of reference (and, indeed, from its composition) it was to be expected that the Commission would treat of nullity on strictly traditional and conservative lines. This, in fact, it has done; and the result is an admirable statement of the Western Church's teaching which nevertheless leaves the reader dissatisfied at certain points, and calls attention to questions which (one would think) can hardly be any longer ignored in discussing marriage and its attendant problems. It is obvious, of course, that there can be no consideration of the law of nullity without an exposition of traditional Western theology as it relates to sex and marriage; but it would greatly have enhanced the value of its Report had the Commission been adventurous enough to take into account the theological and philosophical developments which have occurred in this field during the past thirty years.

The Commission rightly interpreted its terms of reference as requiring an examination of the nature and purpose of marriage, but has restricted itself to matters bearing directly upon nullity—and principally, to the permanence and the formation of marriage. It is indicative of its general approach that for a fuller discussion of the subject the reader is directed to the Report of the Joint Committees of the Convocations, *The Church and Marriage*, published twenty years ago.

A review of the Gospel material leads to an affirmation that Jesus declared marriage to be, in principle, permanent and exclusive; but there follows a discussion of the so-called "Pauline privilege" in which the Commission, while recognizing that the sense of 1 Cor. 7. 15 is perhaps obscure, assumes that the Church has interpreted it correctly as allowing to a deserted convert the right of remarriage.

[1] *The Church and the Law of Nullity of Marriage*. S.P.C.K. 1955. 6s.

This traditional exegesis is accepted almost automatically as the correct meaning of St Paul's *ou dedoulōtai*; but the Commission seems not to have appreciated that to treat marriage as not indissoluble in natural law and the divine purpose strikes at the root of the position it wishes to maintain, and runs counter to our Lord's express assertion that "from the beginning" the one-flesh union was intended to be permanent. The arguments adduced to justify the notion of "Pauline privilege" read no more convincingly in the Report than in conventional treatises on doctrine.

In discussing the view that marriage is a sacrament it is stated, rather ambiguously, "whether [this view] can be held in the Anglican Communion is disputed". This comment needs qualification and explanation. The Anglican Church does not dispute, and never has disputed, the fact that marriage is a *sacramentum* in the strict and original sense of that word—that it is a *signum rei sacrae* or sacred symbol. All that the Anglican reformers rejected (Article XXV) was the comparatively late medieval view that the *rite* of marriage is sacramental in that the moment of exchange of consent is also the moment at which a special "matrimonial grace" is bestowed. While they denied the opinion that Christ had appointed a "sacrament of marriage" in this sense, the reformers (as the Prayer Book shows) certainly did not question the scriptural teaching that marriage is sacramental in that it is a holy sign of Christ and the Church.

The Report does not make clear this important distinction and, in alluding to the couple as themselves "ministers of the sacrament", seems to give tacit approval to the innovation which the reformers condemned. This confusion between rite and symbol recurs in chapter four, where defective intention as a ground of nullity is rejected as inconsistent with "the general doctrine of intention in the sacraments"—the argument being that the unworthiness of the minister does not hinder the effect of the sacrament, and that the same has been held true of his intention. While the Commission is right in rejecting defective intention as a ground of nullity, it is unfortunate that it should have sought at this point to support its view by an allusion which implies that the Church of England holds marriage to be a sacrament in the Tridentine sense.

In discussing consent as a factor in marriage, it is regrettable that the Commission did not seize the opportunity to make a critical review of the traditional conception of the formation of marriage. Not until the mid-12th century was it finally established, after more than a century of controversy, that consent alone effects a marriage—although, strangely enough, no marriage was held to be indissoluble or significant of Christ and the Church until after consummation. There were several reasons (into which we need not go) why the long dispute between the schools of Bologna and Paris should have issued in the investment of the Roman civil law doctrine, *nuptias non concubitus sed consensus facit*, with something of the authority of a text of Scripture. But it has not sufficiently been appreciated that this development really meant the setting aside of the Biblical conception of marriage as essentially a union of man and woman in

one-flesh, established by coitus. With a discussion of wilful refusal to consummate as a ground of nullity yet to come, it would seem that a more realistic evaluation of the function of coitus in the formation of marriage was demanded.

In treating of this question, it becomes clear that the traditional categories used to define marriage are not wholly sufficient. Marriage itself is not one thing, but three at least. It is an ordinance of God instituted "in the time of man's innocency"; it is a personal union of male and female based upon love, and expressed in the establishment and upbuilding of a unique common life of which the one-flesh *henōsis* is the foundation; and it is a legal, social, ecclesiastical institution by means of which the community regulates sexual union in the common interest. It would have made for clarity had the Report expressly stated that for the purpose of considering the law and practice of nullity it had confined itself principally to discussion of marriage as an institution. The respective functions of consent and coitus might then have been better defined—for while consent initiates the marriage as a legal, social, and ecclesiastical institution, the consummating act of coitus establishes the union as a relationship in one-flesh, with all that is thereby implied. Despite the respect which it has for so long commanded and its obvious utility to casuist and canonist, there would seem to be good reason for rejecting the idea that consent alone makes marriage in favour of the more accurate principle that, theologically at any rate, marriage is effected by consent and coitus.

Recognition of this principle would help to obviate another misunderstanding to which the Report seems to lend countenance—namely, the idea that marriage is a *contract* resulting from the exchange of consent. This notion of contract began to emerge at about the same time as the Church accepted the theory, *consensus facit matrimonium*, and its consequences have been unfortunate, and indeed mischievous, since it has undoubtedly been in part responsible for encouraging an easy acceptance of divorce. It has been held, in conformity with this contractual conception of the union, that non-performance of the stipulations supposed to be embodied in the matrimonial consent warrants the repudiation of the "contract"—that is, the marriage. It would perhaps clarify the formation of marriage if it were understood that the *betrothal* is properly the contract, since it is an engagement to enter at some future time into a complete and regular union; and that this contract is performed in two successive and complementary stages—the exchange of consent whereby the couple render their union institutionally regular and valid, and the coitus whereby they make it complete, indissoluble, and fully significant. Thus consent and consummation together discharge the contract of betrothal and initiate a state of life—the "holy estate of matrimony".

For many, however, the most controversial part of the Report will be that in which the Commission rejects wilful refusal to consummate as a satisfactory ground of nullity. This conclusion has already been the subject of criticism, but (according to the traditional eccle-

siastical theory of the formation of marriage) there is no doubt that it is technically correct. To annul a marriage means to declare that what was supposedly a marriage is in fact no marriage—that conditions existed which made matrimonial union between the parties impossible. But wilful refusal to consummate occurs after the exchange of consent, which traditionally establishes the marriage, and could not constitute ground for nullity—though it is arguable that it might be regarded as ground for divorce.

Consent is, *inter alia*, consent to coitus. It is conceivable, however, that at the wedding ceremony there might be on both sides a full intention to consummate the union; but that the supervention of some accident preventing consummation might cause a period of delay during which one party might determine not to fulfil the obligation implicit in the consent. It can hardly be denied that in such an event the aggrieved party should be entitled to relief—and in the absence of the provision of the "Herbert Act", this could be secured only through divorce.

Again, it is conceivable that there may have been a settled but undisclosed determination before marriage to refuse consummation. Such a defective intention, it has been argued, should afford ground for nullity; but the Commission rightly and emphatically states that it is "opposed to any extension [of the law] which could leave the validity of a marriage dependent upon the private stipulations or mental reservation of the parties".

Nevertheless, it would be unreasonable to deny that wilful refusal to consummate inflicts a grave injustice upon the other partner, and that equity alone demands relief—which could only be secured by granting freedom from the union in question, with the right to remarry. The difficulty here is that such freedom is granted by the state—but on grounds which cannot be recognized ecclesiastically; and that if it were granted in terms of divorce, even a strictly qualified endorsement by the Church might prove embarrassing to the latter's witness to the permanence and exclusiveness of marriage. There is, however, a solution which deserves most careful consideration.

In a letter to the *Church Times* of 17th June last, Dr C. K. Sansbury pleaded for machinery by means of which (perhaps through an appeal to the Archbishop of the Province) dispensations could be granted in cases of wilful refusal to consummate, freeing the aggrieved party from the marriage and permitting a new union to be effected. Such dispensation, of course, would be simply and solely an ecclesiastic procedure subsequent to the obtaining of a decree of "nullity" under the present Matrimonial Causes Act—or of a divorce, if the law is amended according to the Commission's recommendation.

Revision of the traditional theory of the formation of marriage would facilitate acceptance of such a solution. If marriage is in fact established, not by consent alone, but by consent and coitus, then wilful refusal to consummate is a circumstance intervening in the process of formation of marriage, so as to prevent its full accomplishment; it occurs between the stage at which the community ratifies

the prospective one-flesh union, and the actual establishment of that union. Despite the theory *consensus facit matrimonium*, the Church has always taught that only the *matrimonium consummatum* is indissoluble; and this conforms to the teaching of the Bible. There would seem, therefore, to be no reason why an unconsummated *matrimonium ratum* should not be dissolved for sufficient reason by the ecclesiastical authority; such a dissolution would simply amount to a declaration that no proper and complete marriage had in fact taken place—but only the necessary institutional formalities which constitute the first stage in the formation of marriage. It may, perhaps, appear that the dispensation envisaged is, in reality, a decree of nullity under another name, but there is actually a clear difference between saying that a marriage was impossible *ex causa praecedenti*, and that it had all the requirements of validity but never attained full completion.

Wilful refusal to consummate directs attention to the place of coitus in marriage. Christian theologians, following a long-standing tradition in the Church, have generally tended to minimize the importance of coitus, save only as a means of procreation. Consequently it was held that only a capacity and willingness for coitus was necessary to render a marriage valid, and not the act itself (cf. the union of Joseph and Mary). In the fifth chapter of the Report this question is considered in some detail, with special reference to "consummation". The Commission acknowledges the impossibility of adequate definition, but rightly accepts penetration as the only test satisfactory in law. Further, while affirming that procreation is one of the chief ends of marriage, the Report endorses the House of Lords judgment in *Baxter* v. *Baxter* that contraception does not preclude consummation—a significant conclusion, which is to be welcomed for its realism and common sense. Moreover, the Commission regards it as a mistake to attempt to distinguish between various types of contraceptive, and to make consummation depend upon the appliance used. It would have been helpful, however, had it been stated that all types of contraceptive are nevertheless not equally satisfactory, for it is arguable that certain appliances are relationally (and therefore theologically) unsatisfactory, even though they do not preclude penetration.

One recommendation by the Commission is to be welcomed. From time to time cases occur in which, despite technical ground for nullity (often based upon coital capacity), a child has been born as a result of artificial insemination or *fecundatio ab extra*. In such cases it is recommended that the doctrine of approbation should be invoked—that is to say, the validity of the union should not be open to dispute.

Despite the Report's technical character, it is written with a clarity which does great credit to the Secretary, Dr A. F. Smethurst. It is, on the whole, remarkably free from errors, but there are a few points to which attention may be drawn. I was surprised to note on p. 11 that the well-known dictum of Ulpian was not quoted verbatim. On p. 15 it is stated that "pre-Reformation Canon Law knew no distinc-

tion between void and voidable marriages"—a statement which appears to be less than accurate, in the light of medieval practice. And on p. 58 the reference to the diriment impediment of *cognatio spiritualis* does not make it clear that prior to the Reformation there were many more degrees of spiritual affinity than those now recognized by canon 1079 of the modern Roman Codex. On the whole, however, this Report is a valuable document; and if its publication serves to focus attention upon the need for a re-examination of many aspects of the traditional theology concerning the formation and nature of marriage, it may well prove to be of greater significance than its compilers will have anticipated.

SHERWIN BAILEY.

Sitting on the Fence

SOME men achieve a rather obvious greatness by over-emphasizing a special truth relevant to a special age. They focus the light upon a particular dark corner: they restore a lost balance of thought by the very exaggeration which any special emphasis makes inevitable. Such leaders of thought are indispensable in any age, but they suffer their Nemesis in the rather thick-headed loyalty of their disciples, who think that the truth seen by their master is the only important truth.

A man who can fight error without falling into the opposite error makes few disciples, but he leaves behind him an expression of truth which is valuable for all time. He is more positive because he seems less positive. Such a man, for instance, was Richard Hooker, who gave the Church of England the balanced teaching of which we should be proud.

The enemies of our Church call this balanced teaching by a harder name. Some sixteen years ago the squire of a parish asked the new curate which party he belonged to. The curate refused to label himself; so the squire growled, "Oh, you sit on the fence, do you?" The curate felt most indignant—but he went home and thought about it: and after sixteen years in country parishes he no longer feels indignant. There are worse things to sit on than fences, especially when the alternatives are a dusty and dangerous road on one side and a wet and muddy field on the other. If sitting on the fence be the vocation of our Church, we should resist the temptation to leave it: it is our difficult duty not to be taunted off it.

The alternatives, to-day, are—on one side—the false peace of authoritarianism, and—on the other—the dangerous thrills of an undisciplined freedom. Freedom is indeed the pre-supposition of God himself, but not freedom without discipline: even God cannot deny the laws of his own Being. This is the fence; and on the one side lies the false peace, the security which is less than Christian: it includes that assurance of salvation which the Puritans claimed and which the extremer evangelicals claim to-day: it includes the authoritarianism of Calvin, the too rigid spiritual direction of the

Roman priest, all equally incompatible with the principle of creative freedom which man enjoys. On the other side of the fence is the escapism which has always been the enemy of the Christian Church from the days of the Johannine epistles, the Colossian heresy, and Ignatius of Antioch until the present day. It is a false mysticism which tries to short circuit the Saviour Christ altogether. It is the false gnosis which seeks to see God in a form in which he will not be seen.

God is Father: he will never be dictator. God is Reconciler—and as such he will challenge, persuade and even entreat; finally we understand he will be Judge; but he will be neither policeman nor prison warder—and even sentence will be passed only by the prisoner at the bar. God is Spirit—and as such he will descend in answer to the prayers of his body the Church; but he will not be turned on like a tap; he will be confined neither between the covers of a Bible nor within the substance of sacred elements, nor yet within the ecstatic experience of the convert. In all these things God as Spirit meets man—but always in the *act*, not in the *thing*. He is not to be cribbed or confined, and yet his promise stands that in the following of certain ways he is always to be met by the believing heart.

It is sometimes said that the doctrine of our Prayer Book is Receptionist, and there are some who will always call the man a Receptionist who sees the pattern of movement between God and man as challenge and response. But the true Receptionist is the man who believes that the quality of his faith determines whether God is present or not: we believe that the quality of our faith governs our vision of God. Our unfaith alone can make God present in a form which is foreign to him: our unfaith turns Fatherhood into Fate, Redemption into Judgment, inspiration into emotion. By the unfaithful God is seen as what he is not: his challenge is refused because what they have met is not God at all but a false picture of him.

The last way of escape, which our Church denies, is to concentrate on a "limited objective": it may be international or industrial peace, it may be social reform or spiritual healing. "In desiring anything as our final perfection which is not so, we do amiss," said Richard Hooker. It is the vocation of the Church of England to care too much for none of these things—or better, perhaps, to see in all of them a grain of truth; and having gathered our handful of grains, not to hoard them jealously and call them a harvest, but throw them back again: for truth must grow in a growing world. In each generation truth must be re-presented; and it is our business to see that it is truth and not just a handful of reactions.

Meanwhile the world will continue to taunt us with not giving a lead, not knowing our own minds—with sitting on the fence. But all these things are the price of the true peace which is neither entire dependence upon man, nor unrestricted freedom, nor vegetable apathy. If we are willing to pay the price we shall keep our peace.

H. A. Blair.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Père Louis Bouyer is a member of the French Oratory.

The Rev. C. F. Evans is Chaplain and Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

Dr Bailey is the Study Secretary of the Church of England Moral Welfare Council.

The Rev. H. A. Blair is Vicar of St James, Southbroom, Devizes, and an Hon. Canon of Salisbury Cathedral.

CORRESPONDENCE

PRIESTS AND FREQUENT COMMUNION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I am deeply grateful for your careful and admirable summary of the letters received in response to the article on "Priests and Frequent Communion"; as also to your many correspondents who appreciate the present burden laid on parish priests, and seek for ways by which they may be saved from the danger of spiritual staleness through having to communicate themselves several times on one day.

I hope that the widespread interest the article has evoked may incline the Convocations to give the matter serious consideration.

Of course I welcome much concerning the remedies proposed:

(1) Communions should be less frequent, with the avowed purpose of expressing the community character of the Lord's Fellowship Meal.

(2) A committee of the Canterbury Convocation is considering the ordination of "Auxiliary" Priests who, while following their secular profession, would assist the parochial clergy to provide as many celebrations as are necessary for the vastly increased, and increasing, number of regular communicants.

(3) It is already quite usual to communicate the sick with the Sacrament taken from the open Communion. But your one sick correspondent voices the longing of (as I believe) the majority of bedridden communicants, for the "atmosphere of awe and mystery which comes in and through the prayer of Consecration"; seeing that such are not capable of the mental and spiritual strain involved of engendering it in themselves by their own prayer and meditation.

To my mind, however, all these suggestions are palliatives rather than solutions. Temperaments differ widely, and this affects our approach to the holy mysteries of the "Wonderful Sacrament". Some, as your correspondence reveals, find in the act of reception the safeguard against staleness, when called upon to celebrate frequently on the same day. Others, while able to celebrate frequently with as great reverence and awe as when administering the Reserved Sacrament,

are anxiously conscious that frequent reception renders them unworthy *partakers*.

Some priests, too, seem to place Holy Communion on the same level as daily prayer and Bible reading; and also to regard it as an act that communicates grace independently of their spiritual apprehension. Others, again, place the Lord's Own Service in a special category, and prepare carefully before their Communion. For this reason I did not propose any general regulation; but only the permission, for any who so desired, that a celebrant, on the same day, "*need* not communicate himself a second time, but all subsequent consecrations *may* be considered as extensions of the first consecration".

Your correspondents do not seem to have been shocked at the suggestion as being impossible on theological grounds. I would, therefore, still press that, in as much as it is enjoined that there must be communicants at every celebration to make it regular and "complete", these communicants, rather than the celebrant, represent the whole Church in the action of the Eucharist; and that for this reason the reception by the celebrant at every Communion is not necessary for a "complete" Sacrament.

BISHOPSCOURT,
ROCHESTER.
2 *December* 1955.

Yours faithfully,
CHRISTOPHER ROFFEN:

DEACONS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Will you please allow me to add somewhat as well as slightly correct the account of the diaconate in Congregational and Baptist churches as outlined by Mr J. M. Ross in the November issue of THEOLOGY? With reference to the footnote on p. 435, it is difficult to see how finance was in general a factor in the decline of the elder in Baptist and Congregational churches. Very few of their pastors or elders were paid. I suggest that the real causes were: (i) Disorganization in the life of the churches due to persecution. (ii) Lack of suitably gifted persons in many congregations. (iii) A lack of a clear distinction between the functions of elders and pastors on the one hand, and of elders and deacons on the other hand. This is evidenced in the fact that, whereas in the 17th century deacons did not take part in the "double consecration" prayers at the Lord's Table, in later days they came to do so, and still do frequently.

I think it is also of some importance to observe that in the early days of dissent deacons were ordained for life, while to-day they are generally elected on a, say, three-yearly basis on the lines of secular administrative bodies.

REDDITCH.
10 *November* 1955.

Yours faithfully,
E. P. WINTER.

[Further correspondence about "Deacons" will appear next month. —ED., THEOLOGY.]

EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

This revolt against "useless tortures prolonged through all eternity" is a little puzzling, for outside the realm of time there can be no such thing as prolongation.

Yours, etc.,

NASHDOM ABBEY,
BURNHAM, BUCKS.
20 *November* 1955.

GODFREY STOKES, O.S.B.

BOOK REVIEWS

MORAL JUDGEMENT. By D. Daiches Raphael. George Allen and Unwin. 16s.

The characteristic grace of the modern British philosopher is that most excellent gift of clarity. Dr Raphael's work is no exception. The book falls into two main sections, entitled respectively "Logic of Morals" and "Metaphysic of Morals". This division derives from the analogy of formal logic, where two main kinds of discussion are involved—the internal structure of a logical system on the one hand and its relation to other possible systems on the other.

The first half of the book, therefore, the investigation of the logic of morals, sets out to clarify the relations between the different moral concepts in everyday use and to present them as a coherent system. This really amounts to a survey of the issues involved in the arguments between utilitarianism and deontology. It begins with a brief but admirable account of the main line of development in these two schools of British moral philosophy. Dr Raphael himself comes down on the side of deontology, but finds two, rather than one, irreducible moral concepts—the concepts of obligation and fittingness. It is a reasonable and well-reasoned presentation of a coherent pattern in our moral thinking, though it may be questioned whether it is necessarily any more satisfactory than other rival presentations.

The second half of the book falls into three main sections. First, Dr Raphael tries to plumb beyond the ordinary commonsense meaning of moral judgments and to draw out the presuppositions on which they rest. By this means he aims to show our system of morality to have an even greater coherence than it has at a simple commonsense level. Morality can exist only where inter-personal relationships exist. It is the means of enabling us, who naturally pursue our own interests, to serve the interests of others. This is the significance of the Kantian principle of treating people as ends in themselves. This seems to me an excellent expression of the co-ordinating unity of system in moral thought, and it is exactly what is implied by the Christian assertion that to love one's neighbour as oneself is the fulfilling of the law. Dr Raphael then goes on to compare his humanist ethical system with other possible systems of

morals, and in the final chapter to consider whether the presuppositions of his moral system are compatible with scientific thought, or in other words to discuss the issue of free-will and determinism. Both these chapters are careful and valuable discussions of the issues involved.

On more than one occasion Dr Raphael disparages the value of a theological basis for such moral concepts as obligation and equality. Yet I venture to suggest that the lack of a theological basis to his moral system is at least partially responsible for what appear to be its two main weaknesses. The distinction between obligation and fittingness seems a somewhat uncertain one. Is it true that we are under an obligation to reward merit but that it is only fitting to produce virtue? If all our actions have a personal reference towards God, does not that provide a greater coherence of system in terms of obligation, which Dr Raphael is feeling after but cannot on his presuppositions achieve? Secondly, what is meant by the "interests" of others which we are to serve? If it means their "good" in some absolute sense only accountable on a theological basis (as I would maintain), then "good" remains an unanalysable ultimate in moral thought, not reducible to terms of fittingness. But this Dr Raphael will not have. He defines interests as "enjoyments and objects of desire" (p. 117). This definition (despite the careful qualifications that he makes) seems to me to lay his system open to all the objections commonly and rightly brought against purely naturalistic theories of ethics.

University College,
Ibadan.

Maurice Wiles.

Eine Heilige Kirche. Zeitschrift fuer oekumenische Einheit. Edited by Friedrich Heiler and Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze. Ernst Reinhardt Verlag, Munich. DM. 6.80.

"One Holy Church, a Journal for ecumenical unity" is the second volume of a new series, and apparently a sequel to "Eiche" and the more famous "Hochkirche" conducted by Freidrich Heiler, who was once a Roman, is now a Lutheran, and has always been a liberal, Catholic. It contains 95 pp. of essays on the Eucharist, "The Sacrament of Churchly Unity". There are 53 pp. where Friedrich and Anne Marie Heiler review the German, and Rennie Smith the English books.

The essays are by Lutherans and Roman Catholics, as well as a Moravian and a Greek Orthodox (the Calvinist and the Thomist Ultramontane are not represented, and the ecumenical spirit which actuates the whole does not prevent a few bricks being thrown at the first and some large boulders at the second!). A few snippets may be of interest, though of course they can no more represent this edifice of multifarious learning than a few bricks or stones can serve as samples of a building.

Professor Mark Siotis' essay on Greek Orthodox Exegesis of what the Bible has to say on the Eucharist sets the tune by moving, per-

haps a little too quickly and easily, from the Biblical text to the Church's traditional interpretation.

J. Thom in a very interesting contribution shows himself to be an advanced exponent of the Liturgical Movement. His solution of the "problem of communication" is to cut the Gordian knot. He wants to see the Latin of the Roman Mass not merely translated, but paraphrased and precised in the vernacular, with all its historical and semasiological subtleties removed, so as to make it immediately intelligible and accessible to a modern congregation. He gives us a number of specimens of how this should be done, and for my part I can think of only two or three Anglicans who would not feel the utmost consternation at his audacity!

Dr Albrecht Volkmann deals with the Lutheran Eucharist. He shows that Luther himself dissociated himself from "the Iconoclasts" (bilderstuermer) and insisted on the Christian man's right to use, if he wishes, the whole apparatus of medieval ornament and ceremony. Dr Volkmann thinks such ritual is needed to enforce sacramental doctrine. We would suggest that biblical faith is a better support!

Friedrich Heiler himself deals with the Protestant (evangelische) Eucharist in its manifold variety and unity. He gives some space to Anglicanism, showing how it unites Calvinist doctrine and Lutheran liturgical practice, and preserved enough "sacramental mysticism" for a sacramental revival to blossom from the Oxford movement. He refers to the "wonderful prayer of humble access".

Dr Paul Schorlemmer writes on the Moravians. He points out that while they adhere to the Lutheran doctrine of the Augsburg Confession, the real expression of their faith and experience is to be found in their hymnology. Of this hymnology we are given specimens in German, in Latin, and also in English (Montgomery and Cennick). One can find a very close parallel in the Methodists with their hymnology and the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England.

O. J. Mehl describes Goethe's attitude and practice in regard to the sacrament. (He may be described as having been a not very keen Lutheran with Catholic inclinations, and plenty of "religiosity".)

R. J. Scheler gives some account of Hermann Schell and other liberal Catholics. F. Heiler deals with Oscar Culmann's latest book on the Petrine claims.

Altogether it is a "very jolly sort of merry-go-round", full of all sorts of interesting miscellaneous information. The Roman Catholics especially sound like extra-liberal Old Catholics. Through all the varieties of allegiance and outlook we can feel the editorship and inspiration of Friedrich Heiler. So it tends to be "broad" and "high" (with inverted commas) if not deep (without them). It is as if this circle had come, after a prolonged study of comparative religion and of the philosophy of religion, to a study of something more centrally Christian. But they carry with them from their former studies a tendency to precis and description and apply their critical faculties to history rather than to doctrine. One misses the rational element, the Thomistic or Reformed scholasticism; one misses above all what should be dominant—the element of Biblical Faith and

obedience. Is one too complacent in saying that THEOLOGY, in its much smaller compass, does manage to preserve these elements in their tension, and prevents anyone from being too much dominated by a single school of thought? But such reflections are hardly justified, since J. Thom in the concluding words of the essay we have already referred to says tersely all that can or need be said, "The Liturgical Movement, the Bible-reading circles and the activities generated by the Youth movement are combining to overcome the present petrifaction (of the Roman Mass). Let us never forget that in this matter alterations of form and similar things are mere human effort. What is ultimately needed is a *Divine New-Creation*. So let us pray, 'Send forth thy Holy Spirit and all shall be recreated and thou shalt renew the face of the earth'."

CORK. COSSLETT QUIN.

GOD IN HIS WORLD. By Charles S. Duthie. Independent Press. 8s. 6d.

THE HOPE OF THE GOSPEL. By James S. Thomson. S.C.M. Press. 10s. 6d.

A PREACHING OF THE CROSS. By E. K. Talbot, C.R. Mirfield Publications. 3s.

God in His World was written at the request of the Congregational Union of England and Wales as their Lenten Book, "with an eye on the Christian layman who is seeking to give expression to his faith in an outreaching concern for others", and shows that evangelism is the responsibility of every Christian and can be done only by those with a true understanding of God derived from study and prayer. Spirit and understanding are not to be divorced. There is a place for specialist evangelists, but God's normal agents for "winning men for Christ" are the pastor and his congregation. The nature and task of the Church spring from the nature and work of God—revealed in self-giving love. There are some good comments on Kenosis and Incarnation. Those brought up in another ecclesiastical tradition will read with interest: "If you reach the point at which a man is ready to confess his sin, accept the forgiveness of God and enter upon the Christian life, you have to consider how best you can aid him to take the last decisive step. It can often be done in straightforward, manly fashion. You say: 'Do you now accept Jesus Christ as your Saviour and Lord?' or ask a similar question. He answers 'I do', and you shake hands on it. An act of prayer naturally follows", and of the author's appreciating "the need for a Protestant equivalent to priestly absolution". While regretting that the sacraments and corporate worship of the Church in winning, and retaining, men for Christ have no place in this book, we also regret that its positive teaching is so little known and practised in our parishes.

In his Glasgow lectures, *The Hope of the Gospel*, Professor Thomson of McGill is concerned with the contemporary world in which some of the dominant ideologies have, so it seems to their devotees, taken the wind out of the sails of the Church and rendered it obso-

lete. With due acknowledgment to Kierkegaard, Tillich and Berdyaev, he sees the strength of Marxism, Logical Positivism or Scientific Humanism, and Existentialism, to be due to the fact that they are "natural religions" of Christendom and sturdy suckers of Christian roots—though barren of the fruits of redemption. Providing their own perverted hopes of supplying man's true needs of body, mind and soul, they present great opportunities, as well as difficulties, of presenting the gospel of "Christ—the Hope of the World". The author vindicates the validity of the gospel of the Incarnation and Atonement, foreshadowed in the O.T. and published in the New, and critically repudiates any other gospel, whether suggested by Liberal Protestants who seek to distinguish between an "original gospel of Jesus" and that of the early Church, or by de-mythologizers who fail to see that myth and symbol are as inescapable in the expression of "scientific" truth, e.g. in physics and psychology, as they are necessary for the communication of spiritual truth and power to finite persons. "The Hope of the Gospel", he says, "is not a cosmological scheme, . . . not a doctrine of time, or a millenial dream. [It] is in a person, Jesus Christ, through whom we have the gift of the Kingdom of God." He looks for a renewed and more thorough application of the Gospel to the economic, intellectual and scientific, and personal, fields by a new outpouring of the Spirit. Of this he sees hopeful signs in the Church becoming less concerned about itself and more zealous to be united in its witness to the world.

A Preaching of the Cross comprises notes of eleven addresses, including the Seven Words, given at St Alban's, Holborn, in Holy Week 1935. A certain roughness may be due to "the accidents of transmission", but there is the vigorous directness one would expect of the late Father Talbot, and a transparent love of the crucified and risen Master and of his people. Among many true sayings are: "We shall never come to own the royalty of Christ unless we are paying due homage to God in our consciences." "Once a man lets God go, he becomes the slave of his own impulses." "We must begin to hate that which needed so costly a forgiveness." His study of the character of Judas is particularly useful.

R. J. Hills.

Brighton.

The Study of Missions in Theological Education. Volume I. O. G. Myklebust, Egede Instituttet, Oslo. N.Kr. 27.80.

This book is much more interesting than its massive, continental appearance and innumerable footnotes would suggest on sight. It is the product of long and wide research and it raises questions which certainly deserve the serious attention of Anglicans. It is fashionable to pay lip-service to the importance, even the primacy, of Christian missions, but what in fact is the net result?

The author of this study begins with the assumption that the world mission of the Church is a theological concern and that a virile theology ought to issue in vital missionary effort. Yet "the need of missionary instruction in theological institutions has only slowly

been recognized". In many universities and colleges it has no place in the syllabus, even if it can sometimes be studied as an optional extra.

The crux of this work is a close examination of Alexander Duff's chair of evangelistic theology, established in 1867. To Scotland goes the honour of being the first country to establish a chair of missions. The author accepts the usual judgment that this venture was not a success and gives good reasons for his conclusions. Duff, for all his greatness—and this is never questioned—was too old for launching such a project; his health was already broken by his years of pioneer service in India; he was far too long-winded in speech, one of his addresses to the General Assembly exceeded 36,000 words; he failed to understand the students and never got on to their wave-length; and his method of approach was too grand and too detailed, beginning with the eternal decrees! But in his person Duff stood for something. At his funeral "for the first time in Scottish ecclesiastical history three Kirks and their Moderators, the representatives of English and American and Indian Churches" joined the procession. His ideas did not die with him, many of them finding fruition in the missionary institutes set up in Scandinavia.

The chapters leading up to Duff give a valuable survey of the place of missions in theological thinking and teaching from the 16th to the 19th century. One is surprised to find no mention of Wesley in the section on 18th-century Britain, and one would have expected some later reference to the discussions of the Eclectic Society and the conversation parties of Charles Simeon. It is noted that the celebrated work *Lux Mundi* makes no reference to the task of world evangelization; the author suggests this indicates the lack of interest in the missionary outreach of the Church in English theology of that period. There is a useful section on Gustav Warneck, the founder of the science of missions, which brings us down to 1910, the year of his death and of the Edinburgh Conference.

Principals of theological colleges and all concerned with C.A.C.T.M. and G.O.E. ought to acquaint themselves with this volume. It could have a salutary effect both on lectures and examinations.

BLACKHEATH. DOUGLAS WEBSTER.

SHORTER NOTICES

A RETREAT FOR LAY PEOPLE. By Ronald Knox. Sheed and Ward. 12s. 6d.

REDISCOVERING PRAYER. By J. L. Casteel. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

THE MYSTICAL VINE. By St Bonaventure. Mowbray. 2s. 6d.

ON CONTEMPLATING GOD. By William of St Thierry. Mowbray. 2s. 6d.

THE BOOK OF THE POOR IN SPIRIT. By "A Friend of God." Longmans. 21s.; pocket edition 8s. 6d.

It is very refreshing to turn from the necessary discipline of theological and biblical controversy to consider books that deal with the very "interiorness" of religion itself. In *A Retreat for Lay People* Mgr Knox gives us once more a book of compelling interest. Here we find in an almost original setting the great themes of spiritual overhaul, commonly used in times of Retreat. Mgr Knox has a most realistic sense of the needs, capacities and aspirations of very ordinary humanity, and the marvel is that he deals with such souls with robust common sense, without in any way lowering "the high calling of God in Christ Jesus". This book will not only help laymen but will inspire any priest to preach, teach and help the souls committed to his charge.

Rediscovering Prayer is written by an American Congregational minister. In view of Billy Graham's mission and his insistence on prayer I have often wondered what kind of prayer it is. We are used at least to liturgical prayer which no doubt shapes our "private" prayer. Here you will find set out, from out of a community of Christians not renowned for their liturgical prayer, the deep ways of "catholic" devotion in its main stream which has provided for many saints and mystics the way to God, through Christ, his Church and Sacraments. It only needs to be said that if the separated fragments of Christ's Church on earth could pray together in these ways the obtuse problems of Faith and Order would receive great graces of healing. Those of us who know something of the central stream of Christian prayer and devotion will find in this book a freshness of treatment which is a sheer delight.

The next two books are gems of classical mystical prayer and theology, and Messrs Mowbray are to be congratulated for their publication—St Bonaventure's *The Mystical Vine* and William of St Thierry's *On Contemplating God*. Father Tyrrell wrote somewhere that the Catholic Church provides a very rich banquet, but one is not expected to eat everything at once. These two short books, with excellent introductions, may not be to everyone's taste. They seem to me a very wonderful protest against the haste, the rush, the flash-like experience of cinema, radio and television so common in our days. What a refreshment it is to turn from these swiftly passing things and quietly to ponder such works. They demand pause, attention, contemplation, but what a reward, and if there is an Eternity, what wonderful preparation!

The Book of the Poor in Spirit by "A Friend of God" has been translated at Downside Abbey. I know not whether to be more grateful to the original author or to the translator and his introduction. Both parts are calming, instructive and inspiring. It is not a book which calls for criticism. As I read it I thought all the time of the mountains which surround the town in which I dwell. Depth and Height, humbling man, yet exalting him. It may seem paradoxical but if you want a "holiday book" here is one.

C. J. Gardner.

Menton, A.M.

JEREMIAH: CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED, TRANSLATED, AND INTERPRETED. By Elmer A. Leslie. Abingdon Press. $4.75.

The writer has aimed at making Jeremiah an "intelligible, interesting and inspiring experience" to "ministers, teachers and students in colleges, theological seminaries and church schools, and thoughtful laymen".

As scholar he acknowledges indebtedness principally to Rudolph and Volz. The book is clearly the fruit of most painstaking study of the text, and frankly incorporates conservative literary-critical conclusions. Chapter IX discusses the "supplements and adaptations" which cannot be attributed to Jeremiah himself.

Many scholars may find it hard to accept to-day the presuppositions implied by a chronological arrangement of the greater part of a prophetic book, and its explanation in terms of a single writer's psychology. Certainly the historical judgments, e.g. on Josiah's reform and its relation to Jeremiah, sometimes seem too slight and facile even for theological seminaries. But we must be grateful for that all too rare thing, a book for the non-professional, which accepts critical difficulties but seeks to make them the genuine foundation of devotional understanding, which is erudite but not obtrusive, and which in the exegesis maintains a high level of religious realism. Ideal for the preacher—if the preacher has the author's balance of mind.

CUDDESDON COLLEGE. JOHN BAKER.

CHRIST—THE HOPE OF THE WORLD. World Council of Churches. 1s. 6d.

WORLD PROBLEMS OF TO-DAY. By Cyril Garbett, Archbishop of York. Hodder and Stoughton. 4s. 6d.

THE QUICKENING WORD. By L. E. Browne. Heffers. 10s. 6d.

THE MEANING OF THE CREATIVE ACT. By N. Berdyaev. Gollancz. 18s.

WAR, COMMUNISM AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By Percy Hartill. James Clarke and Co. 4s. 6d.

This diverse collection of books may be reviewed together because they all share an element of honesty, of sincerity, in face of the world situation.

The Archbishop, one of our two remarkable octogenarians, writes with an almost journalistic slickness but with great theological authority about the malaise of the times. Professor Browne in his Hulsean lectures attempts to reinterpret the Faith for Muslims, and in so doing finds that he is making a reinterpretation for our own "post-Christian" world. Archdeacon Hartill, of the Anglican Pacifist Group, makes an impressive plea for pacifism based not on sentiment but on a serious study of theology. Lastly, the ecumenical group which produced the document on the Christian Hope for the Evanston Assembly is in many ways in striking contrast to the early volume of Berdyaev which is now for the first time put into English.

Berdyaev wrote this book in 1916, before the Russian Revolution, which was to lead to his exile, though at the time he was under

sentence of exile by the Czar. It contains in the most impressive form the germs of all his later writing—his central insistence on Creativeness, the androgynous basis of Man and his revolt against "objectivation". If the Evanston writers tend to re-echo the language of Luther and Calvin and the Archbishop the traditional Anglican *via media,* Berdyaev in some respects recalls the position of Joachim of Floris. He, too, looks for a third epoch of the Spirit in which the ethics of creativeness will take the place of the ethics of the law, the Old Testament, and the ethics of redemption, the New Testament—the epochs of the Father and the Son. He says that "Christianity has not yet been fully revealed as a religion of love". It remains a religion of salvation, of tutelage over frightened children . . . "it has not accomplished love, the life of grace in the spirit". Love has been revealed in the Church only symbolically, liturgically, and ecclesiasticism is hostile to the spirit of love and creativeness. He looks for the Johannine Church of the future replacing the Petrine Church which now is. Then the religious centre of gravity will be transferred from the clerically protected to the prophetic creative.

Berdyaev, like the Evanston group, emphasizes the eschatological, but whereas it makes it difficult for them to see clearly how Christians should act, for Berdyaev it is a challenge to be creative. "We cannot really passively await the coming of Christ, we must be up and go towards him". The Archbishop mourns the breakdown of morals; Berdyaev sees in this the clearing away of a great deal of bourgeois débris in order that the way may be cleared for new interpretation. His chapter on Sex is most remarkable, though it in no way differs from that which he expresses in his *Destiny of Man.*

Berdyaev insists that revelation is not merely of the way in which we should walk, for this would contradict God's idea of man, God's desire to see in man the creator, reflecting his own divine nature. It is just this emphasis on the creative, unpredictable quality in man which is absent in much recent ecumenical discussion. But Professor Browne emphasizes it, though in very different language from Berdyaev. He makes a serious attempt to use the categories of biology for a reinterpretation of the Christian Faith. For him, as for Berdyaev, the Trinity is central, the nature of God which in Christ has become the nature of man. This involves an abandonment of individualism and a submission to the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The goal of the kingdom awaits "the human response to God's gifts, the human endeavour to know God as He has revealed and is revealing Himself, and man's abandonment of self-interest and acceptance of the divine life as his own". The Evanston writers, the Archbishop and Archdeacon Hartill all have something to say about communism. Can it be that the Archbishop is a little self-righteous at this point? Mr Hartill points out that all the aspects of communism which shock us ethically are also present in the democracies in war-time. We are very much aware of the need in a sinful world to match power with power, but what of the way of love? Dr Garbett follows his first section on Christian Standards with a detailed study of various problems—Peace and War, Communism, the Colour

Problem, Nationalism, and Church and State. One of the best sections deals with the problem of Hunger and Population. He occasionally tends to fall into the error of a too great correlation of "the Western way of life" and its survival with Christianity, whereas Berdyaev denounces the bourgeois way of life and sees Socialism and Marxism as merely a prolongation of it rather than ultimate revolt against it. The Evanston document reflects the despair of the European as well as the influence of neo-reformation theology. This has the effect of weakening its emphasis on the tasks that confront the Church in the world. It is often easy to confuse the world that God created in which we are called to be creative with "this world", the present evil age which the Christian is called to resist. The emphasis of these writers is more upon obedience than creativeness. There is much need for the contribution of a sage, like Berdyaev, for such serious efforts at reinterpretation as Professor Browne offers, and the witness of the honest pacifist who takes seriously his faith like Mr Hartill and the hearty indignation of the brave old Archbishop. But what is most needed is the sense that God is in control, that forces which seem hostile to the Church may be the instruments of God for its cleansing, that stripped of worldly power and respectability it may effectively fulfil God's purpose to witness to the life of the Kingdom now and its consummation hereafter.

BANGALORE. LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

DIE THEOLOGIE DER HELLENISTISCH-JÜDISCHEN MISSIONSLITERATUR UNTER AUSSCHLUSS VON PHILO UND JOSEPHUS. By Peter Dalbert. Herbert Reich. Evangelischer Verlag. Hamburg-Volksdorf DM. 9.80.

OFFENBARUNG UND ÜBERLIEFERUNG. By Gerhard Gloege. Herbert Reich. Evangelischer Verlag, Hamburg-Volksdorf. N.p.

These two books are Nos. 4 and 6 respectively of the series *Theologische Forschung*, edited by Dr Hans-Werner Bartsch.

Dr Dalbert treats of the Hellenistic-Jewish missionary literature other than Philo and Josephus, his sources being: Demetrius, Philo the Elder, Eupolemus, Artapanus, Ezekiel the Tragedian, Pseudo-Hecataeus, Aristeas, the Wisdom of Solomon, the Letter of Aristeas, Aristobulus, and the Sibylline Oracles. After an introductory section dealing with the origin and development of the Diaspora, its relationship to its environment, and its missionary aspirations, there follows a discussion of the critical questions and contents of each source and of the authors' treatment of Jewish history, law, and ideas, together with their particular apologetic and missionary tendencies. In the last part of the book, the author singles out for elaboration three key themes from these writings, viz. absolute monotheism, revelation made transcendental and spiritualized, and the election of Israel.

Professor Gloege, in his dogmatic study, examines the relationship between revelation and tradition. He summarizes the classical positions of post-Tridentine Roman Catholicism and of the Protestant-

ism of Luther and Lutheran orthodoxy, followed by a criticism of both in the light of the evidence of the Old and New Testaments. In the concluding section, he presents the outline of his own position: he distinguishes between *paradosis* which is the existential impact of communicated revelation, and historical tradition which is the concrete expression of communicated revelation in the life of the Church in the world; he sees tradition as an ecclesiological and pneumatic phenomenon, and stresses the eschatological connection between revelation and tradition, tradition being derived from the revelation of Jesus of Nazareth and looking forward to the revelation of his *parousia*.

DURHAM. K. H. KUHN.

THE EARLY CHURCH AND THE COMING GREAT CHURCH By John Knox. Abingdon Press. $2.50.

This small book is full of good things. It is of a rare order: it is a positive contribution to the search for Christian unity. No doubt this is because it is the work of a scholar. Dr Knox has perceived that Christians of all sorts have set up the N.T. Church as the norm of a united Church. He dispels this illusion and shows us in the early Church something more valuable to our own times—an ecumenical movement. He goes on to speak with illumination of the shared life in the Spirit and of the common faith and memory of the Community—a Community which is itself part of the event of the Incarnation and inevitably possesses a visible structure.

In conclusion he shows how all Christians—Catholic and Protestant alike—do, and indeed must, accept the so-called "Apostolic" Canon of Scripture and the "Apostles" Creed (both products of post-apostolic times), and argues that they must also accept the "Apostolic" Ministry, maybe also crystallized in post-apostolic times, but of like authority and necessity.

ISLEWORTH. VICTOR DE WAAL.

HOW TO READ THE BIBLE. (Translated from *Ouvrons la Bible.*) By Roger Poelman. Longmans. 6s.

The uncomprehending audiences of Christopher Fry's *The Sleep of Prisoners* at the Théâtre Marigny are a recent proof that even in France the tradition that the Bible is a prohibited book is a very long time adying amongst Roman Catholics. Yet in France and Belgium, as in Germany and Austria, the Biblical revival (the liturgical movement's siamese twin) enjoys the support of many bishops, scholars and publishing houses, and the stream of books at all levels must surely be transforming the inner life of the Church. The present book is intended for the sort of people who went, in Paris or Oxford, to see *The Sleep of Prisoners*, and assumes no real acquaintance with the Bible at all ("After a little practice you will see at a glance that the Roman numeral before the name of the book tells which of the books of the same name is referred to"), but only

a willingness to learn. It takes the reader by means of selected passages and brief comments right through the Scriptures to expound God's plan of salvation in Old Testament and New Testament as a coherent whole, taking care to point out on the way the significance of those passages which may be already familiar to the Roman Catholic who participates in the liturgy.

The main landmarks of the Bible could hardly be better charted: though we fear that some readers may irritably attribute Noe, Josue and Pasch to the vagaries of the American translator.

Cuddesdon College. Wilfrid Browning.

Put on the Armour of Light. By Freda Collins. S.P.C.K. 15s. 6d.

This book is addressed to teachers of class-room and Sunday School who wish to make Early English Church History attractive to their children. It contains a sequence of dramatic sketches written round the lives of the early saints of this country. They are divided into three sections: the first gives a general background of the country before the coming of Christianity; the second describes the period between the lives of St Alban and St Hilda at Whitby; and the third ends with the life of St Edward the Confessor. The sketches are knit together by a framework of conversations between our four patron saints and two children. This framework can easily be adapted to suit the purposes of the teacher and to connect only a selection from the sketches.

The sketches are preceded by notes on the possible uses of the dramatic material from a full-scale pageant to a small overcrowded class-room. There are practical suggestions, already worked out by the authoress with primary school children, for impromptu work and crowd scenes. These notes also contain useful hints on the costumes, production and stage settings, together with a bibliography for further reference on these subjects.

Heston. Barbara Thrush.

Langenscheidt's Hebrew-English Dictionary to the Old Testament. Edited by Karl Feyerabend. 7th impression. Methuen. 7s. 6d.

The lack of a good Hebrew Lexicon at the price at which it may reasonably be required of the student is one of the practical difficulties with which the teacher has to contend. The reissue of the Langenscheidt Dictionary at the modest sum of 7s. 6d. is therefore to be greatly welcomed. It has its defects, especially in its use of the misleading term "future" for the imperfect tense, and of course it lacks any references to Biblical passages. The book disavows any claim to be a work of original scholarship and naturally lacks the niceties and latest fruits of semitic lexicography. Nevertheless, the first-year student will undoubtedly find this dictionary a very great convenience.

Didsbury College, Bristol. S. B. Frost.

THE CRISIS OF THE RURAL SCHOOL. By Roland Bailey. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

GREEN AND PLEASANT LAND. By John Lawson. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

The Crisis of the Rural School ought to be read by everyone concerned with education in the countryside. It is a timely and forthright demand for a fresh approach towards the small rural school remaining after the removal of the eleven-year-olds. Here is no plea for mere retention, for the author bravely seeks to grapple with the thorny issues of buildings, amenities, equipment, teachers' houses; of improvements in teacher-training, methods of appointment and management. (There is an admirable suggestion, worthy of development in further discussion, that rural schools might be grouped without losing village identity.)

Mr Bailey's case is at its weakest when related to his appraisals of rural community. The core of this problem is, as it has been since manorial times, the master-man relationship. Any effective policy for rural education must be based on proper study of this relationship, for out of it the new leadership of the village will emerge. Mr Bailey's policy cannot afford to risk confusion, in village eyes, with that of those who would save the schools from the wrong motives.

Obviously Mr Lawson knows his "green and pleasant land", and clearly sees that the corporate life of the modern village depends on interests and amenities that the larger unit or country town can supply. He is concerned to survey the problems of the Methodist Church in the villages, though he makes some kindly and courteous comments on rural Anglicanism. He claims that the Circuit may still be the means for renewal in the isolated and sparsely attended chapel. It might be that some Rural Deans could profitably study the author's account of Circuit methods.

Without doubt Mr Lawson turns ground which he is well qualified to turn deeper. It has irked one reader that he has not done so. None the less, he is a guide to follow for undertsanding of the countryside in which Mr Bailey would unfurl a much-needed banner.

CONGRESBURY. A. S. CRAN.

THE OFFICE OF WOMAN IN THE CHURCH. By Fritz Zerbst. Translated by Albert G. Merkens. Concordia Publishing House, St Louis, Missouri. $1.00.

This is a compact study of biblical and theological considerations bearing upon a question of practical importance for the Church to-day. The Pauline texts are neither explained away nor treated as closing the door on discussion. Instead they are patiently examined in their context with a view to elucidating the principles that underly them. The author believes that the *ὑποταγή* of woman to man belongs to the order of creation and is necessary to monogamy: it is therefore part of the *κήρυγμα* which the Church has to proclaim for this dispensation. It must, however, be seen to be based, not upon any supposed superiority of the male sex, but upon the declared will of God. In the order of redemption any basic inequality of the sexes

is done away, as will be manifest hereafter. Even now it is necessary to distinguish the authentic ὑποταγή of Christianity from the legalistic perversions of it which have appeared in age after age of the Church's history. This study is undertaken from a Lutheran standpoint, and for Anglicans the argument would at some points take a different course. Nevertheless, it is admirably strong just where we are weak. It is to be hoped that this book will be stocked by our bookshops, and that it will be widely read and its contents digested before any further modification of our traditional practice is made.

HAMBRIDGE. G. F. HILDER.

BUT THEY WON'T LIE DOWN. Three plays by Stuart B. Jackman. S.C.M. Press. 5s.

These three plays are an attempt to give the Christian Mystery a modern rendering. They are sincerely written with some forceful dialogue and a feeling for character. One of them, "The Prototype", which is the story of the raising of Lazarus as it appears to a modern mind, does in part succeed in this attempt. The other two plays, "The Backyard Miracle", which retells the story of the birth of Jesus taking place in a modern hotel, and "The Blind Man", which gives a modern reaction to Jesus walking through the crowd healing the sick, do not suggest anything deeper than one of the many superstitious creeds which are rife to-day.

The reason for this is that the author's premise rests on a fallacy. The incarnation of the Christian mythos took place at a definite point in history, namely the first century of our era. To transpose an historical happening as though it were happening to-day is to make it untrue—fictional. The psychological and religious factors which made that event possible in the 1st century are not present in the 20th.

It may be that for the modern mind a religious play succeeds when it does not ostensibly set out to be religious but accepts religious conviction as its very foundation. Has not Toynbee in his monumental work come to the conclusion that all man's history is in essence a religious quest? It may be that these are not the questions with which the modern mind is concerned—it has passed beyond them. Its real dilemma goes much deeper and as yet remains unanswered.

MARY GREW.

LONDON.

THE HEART AFLAME. By Simone Saint-Clair. Translated from the French by Susan Anne Moyse. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

This book contains, wrapped up in much cotton wool, an intimate story of real interest, written with a touching sincerity by a mother who lost everything when she lost her two sons. By contact with them, at first through mediums and then directly, for she is herself a "sensitive", she regained, she tells us, her faith. At any rate her faith in "Them" and the values for which "They" stood.

Her elder son, before his death, gave her some good advice: "Forgive me if I say that you are wrong when you go to these mediums; Kik himself would tell you so." This she herself came to realize. It was perhaps less good advice when, urging her to write this book, "They" told her: "Write into it your philosophy."

The English of the translation is without distinction, which perhaps does not help the philosophical sections.

M. Burdess.

Ormskirk.

Baptism. Church Albums, No. 1. Country Churchman. 1s. 6d.

This illustrated brochure ($11\frac{1}{4}'' \times 8\frac{3}{4}''$) for parents of children who are to be baptized is an excellent idea and much enterprise has gone into its production. Both the printed matter and the numerous photographs are admirably conceived and contain a wealth of wholesome instruction. We would urge parish priests to write for a specimen copy (1s. 6d.) to Hazeldene, Great Shefford, Newbury, Berks. There are special rates for bulk orders from parishes.

The Finest Job in the World. (An Open Letter to Senior Schoolboys.) By F. Barrie Flint. Obtainable from S.P.C.K. bookshops. 4d.

A well-written description of the life and work of a priest which may suitably be disseminated not only among schoolboys but among churchpeople generally through tract-cases, etc.

The Primacy of Preaching To-day. By Arthur A. Cowan. T. and T. Clark. 7s. 6d.

A scrappy set of Warrack Lectures. They do however contain a great many illustrations which the author must have drawn from his common-place book and which other preachers will find useful.

This Shining Day. By Cecil Hunt. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

"Each day has its shining cluster of saints" and this day book seeks to introduce us to their rich variety of self-offering, deliberately choosing some who are obscure "to animate a dedication or place name which until now has been for most people a lifeless designation", and framing the vignettes with apt quotations from "masters of the spirit" canonized and uncanonized.

Sydney Smith, the author reminds us, on receiving a letter inscribed with a Saint's Day, headed his reply "Washing Day"; this was then supposed to be witty. Not all Christians, it is true, find the remembrance of days helpful: some because they lack the necessary historical knowledge and cannot bring the dry bones of a brief out-

line to life; some because, believing that each day brings its own opportunity, they find such distinctions distasteful. They would write "Washing Day" in all seriousness. Many of these shining figures, however, entered glory by triumphing over difficulties very much of the washing-day type, and those who would wish for fuller acquaintance and yet, because of washing day and other things, have little time to dig out the relevant facts, could find this book a great joy. It has freshness and charm. It contains much information and many spiritual gems, and it is done with a light touch and considerable discernment.

M. Burdess.

Ormskirk.

The Christian Use of the Psalms. By Henry de Candole, Bishop of Knaresborough. Mowbray. 6s.

This is just the competent, adequate and modest little book we have come to expect of its author. He admits he knows no Hebrew, but then who does now except a few Jews and professors? He claims, however, to be able to help us towards a devotional and liturgical understanding of the Psalms, and has already shown how well he can do it by his previous writings, including at least one article in Theology.

He points out that we can use a hymn to express our praise or penitence without having to understand the circumstances in which its author wrote it, and that the same applies to the Psalms. We do not use them as historical documents, or limit them to their original significance. Such a Christian application is perfectly obvious and natural. He prefers not to call it "mystical", and distinguishes it sharply from the allegorical interpretation. He ends with a set of short Psalms headings to use in announcing the Psalms of the day. Many will find these invaluable.

May we venture to correct a couple of minor misstatements on page 18? Coverdale translated from German as well as Latin. And the Church of Ireland did not adopt the English Revised Psalter in 1927, but made a few cautious corrections. The Committee had, of course, the English proposals before them. So, if the lion has evacuated the Irish Republic, the unicorn still prances there.

Cork Cosslett Quin.

Philosophy and Religion. By George Whitfield. (Gateway Handbooks.) Religious Education Press. 6s. 6d.

This is a competent text-book, limited in depth and language to suit sixth-form boys, but ranging pretty widely. The author, who is headmaster of Hampton Grammar School, is able to be biblical without ceasing to be liberal, and can be profound in simple language. He will tell even a moderately well-read reader a few things he does not know.

C. Q.

SPARKS IN THE STUBBLE. By Margaret Cropper. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

This is a sequel to *Flame touches Flame*. It contains biographies, varying greatly in length and free from all padding, of Nelson, Bray, Law, Newton, Hannah More, Wilberforce and Robert Walker. The latter is the clergyman of whom Wordsworth wrote a sonnet. Five pages tell the little that is known of him. Miss Cropper writes so limpidly and transparently that we hardly realize her brilliance.

C. Q.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Bernard Meland, *Faith and Culture* (12s. 6d.).

BLACKFRIARS: F. D. Joret, O.P., *An Introduction to Contemplative Meditation* (3s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: Raymond Firth, *The Fate of the Soul* (2s. 6d.).

CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: *The Church and Young People* (3s.).

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND (121 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH): *Interim Report of the Special Commission on Baptism* (2s.).

ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES PRESS: R. C. Johnson, *Psychical Research* (6s.).

EPWORTH PRESS: W. F. Howard, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation* [New edition, edited and revised by C. K. Barrett; for review by Noel Davey see THEOLOGY, April 1932, pp. 236 f.] (16s.).

HIGHWAY PRESS: John Taylor, *Man in the Midst* (6s.); D. Webster, *What is Spiritual Healing?* (1s. 6d.); D. Webster, *And who is my neighbour?* [Bible readings] (3s.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: Roger Pilkington, *In the Beginning—The Story of Creation* (5s.).

LONGMANS: Harry N. Hancock, *And After This?* (8s. 6d.); Harry Blamires, *Blessing Unbounded* (12s. 6d.); Polycarp Sherwood, O.S.B. (Ed.), *St Maximus the Confessor: The Ascetic Life; The Four Centuries on Charity* [Ancient Christian Writers: No. 21] (25s.); A Carthusian, *They Speak by Silences* (7s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Eric F. F. Bishop, *Jesus of Palestine* (30s.).

MOSCOW PATRIARCHATE: Nicholas, Metropolitan of Krutitzy and Kolomna, *For Peace!* (n.p.).

NATIONAL BOOK LEAGUE: V. A. Demant, *The Elements of Christianity* [Reader's Guide] (2s. 6d.).

NELSON: E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J., *Providence and Suffering in the Old and New Testaments* (15s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: André Parrot, *The Flood and Noah's Ark* (7s. 6d.); André Parrot, *Discovering Buried Worlds* (7s. 6d.); André Parrot, *The Tower of Babel* (7s. 6d.); Rudolf Bultmann, *Essays—Philosophical and Theological* (21s.).

S.P.C.K.: Amy Carmichael, *Edges of his Ways* [Daily readings for a year from the writings of the founder of the Dohnavur Fellowship: see THEOLOGY, February 1954, pp. 75 f.] (10s. 6d.); John Townroe, *Prayer for Busy People* [Reprint of the article in THEOLOGY, July 1955] (9d.); Charles Smyth, *Church and Parish* (17s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON

INTERNATIONAL SUMMER COURSES FOR THE CLERGY

at ST. AUGUSTINE'S, CANTERBURY

The Central College of the Anglican Communion

1956

First Session (July 9-21) GENERAL SUBJECTS.

Lecturers: Dean F. C. Synge (South Africa), Canon T. R. Milford (Lincoln), Rev G. F. S. Gray (Fellow of the College).

Second Session (July 23-August 4) CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

Lecturers: Dr F. H. Hilliard (University of London), Dr D. R. Hunter (New York), Rev J. C. Fenton (Wentworth, Yorks).

Third Session (August 6-18) COMMUNICATING THE GOSPEL.

Lecturers: Canon C. K. Sansbury (Warden), Canon T. O. Wedel (Washington), Dr W. R. Coleman (London, Ontario).

"*A wonderful source of inspiration and information.*"
Some participants in 1955.

Full details from:

The Secretary of the Summer Courses, St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, Kent.

New in DUCKWORTH'S *Studies in Theology*

The Apostolic Age

G. B. CAIRD, M.A., D.PHIL.

The Professor of New Testament Language and Literature at McGill University reviews the development of early Christianity and the events of the first century A.D. in their bearing upon it. He begins with a description of the Roman Empire and the place occupied in it by the Jews; continues with the evolution of the Christian community in the Eastern Mediterranean and its subsequent "mission" to Rome itself; and closes his story at the final break between Christianity and Judaism, the beginnings of persecution by Rome and the deaths of the first generation of those who had been pillars of the early church.

In addition to the usual Index and Bibliography, a chronology of the period and the references to Christianity in Tacitus and Pliny are included as Appendices.

"This book gives the impression of a vast reservoir of detailed knowledge behind it. . . . Private students will find this book most helpful; teachers will find it invaluable. Within its compass there is no better introduction." —*British Weekly.*

Cr. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

OTHER RECENT VOLUMES AT 9s. 6d. NET

The Text and Canon of the New Testament (Souter & Williams) (revised edition)
A Short Comparative History of Religions (T. H. Robinson)
The Doctrine of the Trinity (R. S. Franks)

GERALD DUCKWORTH & CO. LTD., 3 HENRIETTA ST., LONDON, W.C. 2

By Eugene Masure

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MYSTICAL BODY

"*The Christian Sacrifice*, Dom Illtyd Trethowan's translation of Canon Masure's remarkable treatise, *Le Sacrifice du Chef*, has now been followed by a translation [by Anthony Thorold] of *Le Sacrifice du Corps Mystique*. . . . These two books together should establish their author in the very forefront of contemporary theology, and, in spite of its unpretentious claims and its, at first sight, limited field, the book now under review may without exaggeration be described as one of the most important theological works of the century. . . . Masure's magnificently coherent and lucid exposition is of importance for two main reasons. In the first place it rescues Eucharistic theology from the constricted and negative state in which it had got by the end of the Middle Ages and still more in the Counter-Reformation. . . . Secondly, . . . the traditional objections of Protestant theologians to Catholic Eucharistic theology lose most, if not all, of their force when the Catholic doctrine of the Mass is stated as Masure states it. . . . Roman Catholic theology is far more fluid, over longish periods, than either its opponents or professors are usually ready to admit . . . there is far greater readiness among Roman Catholics than among Protestant theologians to-day to call in question the formulations of the sixteenth century with a view to healing the divisions of Western Christendom. . . . "

—THE REV. E. L. MASCALL, D.D., in *The Church Quarterly Review*.

12*s* 6*d*

THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE

"This is a remarkable book. . . . It would be a great mistake to suppose that Christians of other Communions have little to learn from Canon Masure, . . . there is real and important common ground."

—THE GUARDIAN.

"The priest is advised to buy it, to read it and to live by it."

—THEOLOGY.

"The English-speaking world has reason to be grateful to Dom Trethowan for this limpid translation of a beautiful piece of French prose, so the theologians of all nationalities must be grateful for his discovery, which may remind them to make up for their neglect over the past twelve years."—THE TABLET.

"Profound work . . . enlightening to those of any faith to whom mysticism is the only acceptable explanation of life."—TRUTH.

15*s*

BURNS & OATES